

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1515

KELVIN SIMMONS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MARY J. HUFF, formerly known as Mary H. Simmons; LINDA STARKE, Social Worker, Chesterfield/Colonial Heights Department of Social Services; CHESTERFIELD/COLONIAL HEIGHTS DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; PAMELA MOSELEY, Social Worker, Virginia Department of Social Services, Henrico District Office; S. HINTON-MCRAE, Support Enforcement Specialist, Virginia Department of Social Services, Henrico District Office; VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; COUNTY OF CHESTERFIELD, VIRGINIA; CHESTERFIELD COUNTY COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY OFFICE; MARY E. LANGER; ELIZABETH SMYERS, Office of the Commonwealth Attorney; CHESTERFIELD COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT; R. D. ASH, Detective, #646; J. T. WILLIAMS, Officer, #449, Chesterfield County Police Department; THOMAS J. LOVING,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, District Judge. (CA-03-90-3)

Submitted: July 24, 2003

Decided: July 29, 2003

Before MICHAEL and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kelvin Simmons, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Vaughan Sommers, HAIRFIELD, MORTON, WATSON & ADAMS, P.L.C., Richmond, Virginia; Steven Latham Micas, County Attorney, Michael Steven Jonas Chernau, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Chesterfield, Virginia; Andrew Cameron O'Brion, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Joshua Noah Lief, SANDS, ANDERSON, MARKS & MILLER, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Kelvin Simmons appeals the district court's order denying relief on his civil complaints. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Simmons v. Huff, No. CA-03-90-3 (E.D. Va. Apr. 18, 2003). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED